MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 7,1926.

The fourth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1926 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building, on Thursday, January 7, 1926.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Greenleaf,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
Mr. Delano,
Mr. Taft,
Mr. Garfield,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Executive Officer.

The Commission welcomed Mr. Garfield, who attended a meeting of the Commission for the first time.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held December 10 and 11, 1925, were approved.

2. MEETINGS OF THE COMMISSION: The Chairman advised that the amount of business which was being referred to the Commission of Fine Arts by Committees of Congress and Executive Officers of the Government was of such proportions that it would be necessary to arrange for a meeting of the Commission each month during the remainder of this fiscal year. The following dates were agreed upon: February 18, March 25, April 22, May 27, and June 17. The Secretary stated that a supplemental appropriation of $1500 would be necessary to meet the expenses of these meetings, and Mr. Moore said he would see the Director of the Budget about the matter. (Mr. Moore and Mr. Caemmerer were in conference with General Lord, Director of the Budget, on January 16th, and the need of this amount was recognized by him).

3. NAVY AND MARINE MEMORIAL: The Commission gave further consideration to the model of the Navy and Marine Memorial. Mr. Moore said that since the December meeting of the Commission he had talked with Mr. French about the design, informing him that the Commission did not think the design suitable for Hains Point and that it should be made smaller; and that Mr. French had said he favored the design primarily because it was something different from the old standard forms of memorials.

Mr. Moore then asked Mr. Taft for his opinion with regard to the design, and then in turn each of the other members of the Commission.

Mr. Taft said: "I expressed my feeling in the letter which I sent you on the subject. This reads as follows:

December 23, 1925.

----"I saw the Piatta model the other day in Mr. French's studio and at the risk of being counted 'sentimental' I must confess to having been greatly impressed by it.

Let me begin by saying, however, that the whole idea is diametrically opposed to my own 'confession of faith'. More even than most of my colleagues I like to see monumental art massive and suggestive of eternity. It is a surprise to myself that I like this fragile and perhaps fantastic conception. Undoubtedly it is its emotional content which appeals to me; the sculptor has had a thought--a new and original thought--and this in itself gives one a shock. How many of our monuments embody a thought or reveal an emotion? Here we have both very poetically expressed. We are paying our tribute to those who have died at sea where the wave is the tomb and the moan of the sea gulls the only requiem. I frankly admit that I find it profoundly moving--much more so than the new Meade Memorial with all its studied allegory and competent workmanship.

While I am not a believer in Tolstoi's theory that the greatest art is that which appeals to the greatest number of people, I do feel that in this case we have offered us a thought which would be recognized and grasped by all who see it and that this lucidity of meaning is a quality not to be despised.

Mr. Corbett's elaboration of the ripple-motif seems to me very beautiful as well as original. Like the rest of the design it puts the 'hint of eternity' into a symbol of what is most ephemeral.

I agree with the other members of the Art Commission that the Piatta design is not suitable for the important site contemplated, but I do feel that it is well worthy of perpetuation in some other place. If a suitable location can be found the monument will have my approval."

"While this design is contrary to every principle that I have ever entertained in monumental art, it seemed to have in it much poetical suggestion, which is perhaps more than equivalent, so that we might make an exception in accepting the work in this case. There is something appealing in the thought: a memorial to men who perished at sea--and all that remains is the wave and the birds over-head! Perhaps the most beautiful thing about it I find in the steps which so ingeniously elaborate the ripple-motif. The design is so original, so different from our usual monumental art that I find myself greatly interested and am tempted to swerve from the safer path, as happens now and then to all of us. My perplexity is somewhat increased by the fact that I have recently seen a remarkable arabesque of flying sea-gulls by Gaston Lachaise. I wonder which of the sculptors invented the idea--or if it is an age-old motif unfamiliar to myself alone. So I leave it in a rather confused state of mind; a condition which we all more or less share, I fancy. Of one thing I am very certain, however, I would not urge this design for Hains Point. I think that something monumental should be placed there."

Mr. Moore said the Commission long ago expressed itself in regard to the design, but the Association asked the Commission, would not they please withhold their official disapproval and let them try again? The Commission pointed out at that time that the objections were fundamental, but the Commission had no disposition to "shut them off" from any further consideration that they might wish to make, so that they have gone ahead at their own risk.

Mr. Medary said, "I have not anything to add to what we discussed at great length last time with Harvey Corbett and the sculptor. As to the merits

of the design, it is wholly inadequate as a piece of art for that spot (Hains Point). It is the water-gate to Washington, it is the axial position as you come up the river. It is a site which must have something massive and strong, something that will count for a long distance as you come up the river. I am certain that point should not be used for something playful, poetic, and an incidental thing. If it is to be used it should be in a place where there is a water background rather than on this important spot which you see as you come up the river.

"The back of this design is difficult to see. It is a great mass of bronze. There is no shape or form to it and it does not count from the rear at all. I think if you could see that from a break in the trees and not in a tremendously important site, it would be worthy of consideration, but it should not be placed at Hains Point. I think the sentimental thing is because it is a "stunt" and "stunts" don't last through the ages."

Mr. Moore said there are two other points--the Anacostia Park, which is being developed as a pleasure park and is increasing all the time, and then there are the islands of the Potomac towards the Virginia shore.

Mr. Delano stated that Mr. Medary had said everything he had to say,- that he agreed with every word of it. Mr. Delano thought some site could be found along the Potomac.

Mr. Mowbray said he was very much inclined to follow the conclusion reached the last time and as expressed by Mr. Medary. "I believe that is the logical conclusion and I am perfectly in harmony with it".

Mr. Greenleaf said, "If there can be an adequate Navy and Marine memorial I do not think there is a better place to put it than at Hains Point. Now may not that be a way to meet it? Perhaps it will require another design than

that of Piatta, but after all if the interest of the country at large is aroused and they want an adequate site, why is not that a place for it? May it not be well for us to put that view before them?"

Mr. Mowbray felt that because certain sculptors took a liking to the design it might be appropriate to place it, reduced in scale, at another site, but it should not be placed at Hains Point. Mr. Medary agreed that there are two conclusions, either abandon this design and secure one adequate to the site, or else put this design at another site.

Mr. Greenleaf then raised the question whether that design placed at another site and reduced in scale would be appropriate as a Navy and Marine Memorial of the United States. Mr. Greenleaf said he was not inclined to favor placing the Navy and Marine Memorial of this country in a secondary position. He then called attention to the steps, which according to the design would require about 200' x 250' of masonry; if placed at another site, reduced in scale, it would be necessary to re-study the architectural treatment of the design, and would that be adequate for a Navy and Marine Memorial?

Mr. Garfield was asked to give his impression of the design as one who had not heretofore known of the problem. Mr. Garfield said his first impression was it should have a background. The idea of the composition of sea gulls depends for effect on having the sky as a background rather than any masonry, but unless it is large he did not think the effect could be produced satisfactorily. To change the location brings up the problem of adapting the design to that site. It seemed to Mr. Garfield a subject to be painted rather than produced in this way.

Consideration was then given to a possible site other than Hains Point. The Anacostia Park was suggested and consideration was given to the islands

along the Virginia shore, but it was thought that until the Memorial Bridge is built, these islands could not become available for memorials. Thereupon the East Potomac Park map was inspected, and after examining the shore line of the park, a prospective site was suggested at the entrance of the water channel on the river bank of East Potomac Park. Just how the memorial should be erected there would be a problem for study by the architect and sculptor of the Navy and Marine Memorial.

The Commission voted unanimously---

That the design showing the sea gulls should not be placed at Hains Point; but that the Commission would welcome an appropriate design for Hains Point.

That a site be offered to the Navy and Marine Memorial Association, if they wished to adhere to the "sea gull" design, at the water channel proposed on the river bank of East Potomac Park, as indicated on the plan of the park; but that studies for that location, with a significant reduction in the scale of the design, would be required by the Commission from the Navy and Marine Memorial Association and after that still further studies of the details of the sculpture and of the architecture. The Commission also advised taking out a lot of symbolism.

The Commission regard Hains Point a very appropriate place for a Navy and Marine Memorial and advised that if the Navy and Marine Memorial Association would submit an appropriate design for a memorial at Hains Point they would grant the site for such memorial.

A report was forwarded to the Navy and Marine Memorial Association. (Exhibit A).

4. MCKINLEY MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Harris, Municipal Architect, submitted a study showing the whole layout of the McKinley Manual Training High School. The architect members of the Commission made certain suggestions, which will be embodied in the plan.

5. MAP OF PROPOSED SITES FOR SCHOOL HOUSES: Mr. Harris submitted a plan showing the location of present and proposed school buildings in the District of Columbia. The Commission decided to give the map attention in connection with projects of the National Capital Park Commission.

6. BIRD HOUSE, ZOOLOGICAL PARK: Under date of December 31, 1925, the following letter was received from Dr. Charles D. Walcott, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, with which he submitted a plan for a new Bird House to be built in the Zoological Park:

> "The architect's plans for the proposed new Bird House for the National Zoological Park have now been prepared and I am sending them herewith for the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts. If it is desired to have some one present to explain the plans when they are taken up for consideration, I shall be glad to arrange for this.
>
> "In addition to the plans transmitted, we have a water-color sketch of the front elevation of the building, which has been temporarily withheld for a special purpose, but which may be forwarded later if the Commission desired to have it."

Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Assistant Secretary, Dr. Wm. M. Mann, Supt. of the Zoological Park, and Dr. Baker of the Smithsonian Institution, were present to confer with the Commission. Dr. Wetmore said the Bird House in the Zoological Park at present was built 28 years ago and for several years they have had in contemplation the erection of a suitable building. The Budget Bureau thereupon in the estimates for 1927 approved an item authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for an exhibition building for birds, in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Smithsonian Institution, at a cost not to exceed $102,000. Dr. Wetmore said the Zoological Park comprises 175 acres and they have as many as 40,000 to 60,000 visitors a day. No admission is charged to enter the Zoo.

Mr. Moore called attention to a parkway proposition which has received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts to provide a direct connection

between Rock Creek Park and the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. Dr. Wetmore said he understood an agreement to bring this about has been reached by the Smithsonian Institution with the Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks. Dr. Wetmore stated that there are some days as many as 11,000 automobiles on the grounds and he hoped the time would come when they would have to park machines at the entrance of the park and walk to the exhibition buildings on foot.

Dr. Wetmore advised that the design submitted was prepared by Bertram Russell, architect, who spent several months last winter in the park making a study of the plan. The plan was made also in consultation with Mr. Harris, Municipal Architect. The design provides for four "L's" at a common center. Their problem is to provide housing space for the exhibits so they can be viewed with reasonable comfort. They thought by constructing a square building expansion could be made by building a series of "L's" as additional space is needed.

The Commission recommended restudy of the design,-that the facade should be simplified greatly; in the interior the eliptical arches should be eliminated; the main sky line should be made to bear some relation to the piers below. The Commission also desired to have a statement as to the difference in cost between brick and stone or some other material.

7. SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR MEMORIAL. Mr. A. R. Talbot, Head Consul of the Modern Woodmen of America, at Lincoln, Nebraska, having advised that the Spanish-American War Memorial Committee, of which he is chairman, sincerely desired advice as to their design, the Commission gave the matter further consideration and recommended a restudy of the design with a view to simplification (Exhibit B).

MASSACHUSETTS WORLD WAR MEMORIAL:

8. Under date of December 17, 1925, the following letter was received from the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission:

"Representatives of the memorial commission of the State of

Massachusetts appeared before the American Battle Monuments Commission at its meeting on December 14, 1925, and requested approval to the erection of a memorial near St. Mihiel, France, in memory of the dead from that state during the World War. As a result of this conference the American Battle Monuments Commission approved the site and general plans of the memorial subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

"There are enclosed herewith two sketches of the proposed memorial, one photograph of the model figure and a descriptive pamphlet giving detailed information of the memorial and site, The pamphlet is inaccurate in that the present plans for the memorial do not include the draped figure of the American soldier.

"It is requested that this memorial be considered by the National Commission of Fine Arts and the American Battle Monuments Commission be notified as soon as convenient concerning its approval or disapproval."

The matter was submitted to Mr. Taft, who recommended approval of the design, with the understanding that the figure of the recumbent soldier be eliminated and instead a large inscription be placed. The Commission concurred in the recommendation and approved the design (Exhibit C).

9. MOTHERS' MEMORIAL FOUNDATION: Under date of December 21, 1925, the following letter was received from Hon. R. N. Elliott, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds:

"Please favor the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with your views with regard to the joint resolution (H.J.Res.90), 'To provide a site for the erection of a building of service for the Mothers Memorial Foundation at Washington, District of Columbia."

"A copy of the measure is inclosed for your information."

The Commission decided that the information at hand concerning this memorial was insufficient to enable them to make comprehensive recommendations concerning it; that they would not recommend a site for the building in the absence of a plan for it. Also if a site is chosen and permission to erect the building is received by the Foundation, assurance would have to be given that the building will be completed. The Commission called attention to the unfinished George Washington Memorial, the foundations of which were begun

over their protest and nothing further has been done on the structure. A report was forwarded to Mr. Elliott (Exhibit D).

10. JANE A DELANO MEMORIAL: At the request of Miss Mabel T. Boardman, Secretary of the American Red Cross, the Commission considered a sketch for a memorial to Jane A. Delano, a Red Cross Nurse of the World War. It was stated that legislation for it is to be introduced, having in view the erection of the memorial in the park area along 17th Street, opposite the Red Cross Building.

The Commission disapproved the erection of the memorial on the area proposed, as it is part of a cross axis of the Mall Development and has been reserved as a park area. The Commission recommended that this memorial be erected on the first platform in front of the Red Cross Building, where it would be located similarly to the Alexander Hamilton statue on the south front of the Treasury Department building. The sketch was disapproved as being an unsatisfactory treatment of the proposed memorial. A design in relation to the proposed site will have to be made. The Commission advised the American Red Cross accordingly (Exhibit E).

11. FLAG-STAFFS FOR STREETS OF WASHINGTON: By letter dated December 19, 1925, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia requested the views of the Commission of Fine Arts as to a plan of the American Legion to erect flag-staffs on the principal streets of Washington, as follows:

> "The District of Columbia Department of the American Legion has submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a proposition for the installation on the public highways of metal staffs twelve feet by seven-eighths inch, to be set in sockets at intervals of twenty five feet long and twelve inches back from the curb lines, on which is to be displayed at times of public celebrations the American flag, three feet by five feet. While the locations have not been definitely indicated, it is presumed that

they would be in the business section, as the American Legion desires to encourage business establishments to display the flag in furtherance of a national campaign of education in the proper respect to the flag.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to request that they be given the benefit of the views of the Fine Arts Commission in the matter."

Mr. Frank L. Peckham and Mr. Ray Roberts, representing the American Legion, were present to explain the project, and submitted the following statement dated January 7, 1926, from Capt. Julius I. Peyser, Department Commander of the American Legion, District of Columbia:

"The American Legion, ever zealous of the preservation of patriotic ideals and customs, is sponsoring a new flag system for Washington that we believe will discourage the indiscriminate use of the Flag, and make it possible for the entire city to be fittingly bedecked with the National Colors on the proper occasions.

During the past there has been a tendency to use the Flag more for decorative and commercial purposes, seldom displaying Old Glory except on the occasion of some convention or gala festival. The Flag should never be used for any other purpose other than to honor an appropriate occasion, or as a means of identification of those who raise it; and regardless of the purpose for which used, certainly should not be tied in the middle and draped in every conceivable fashion, as we oft times see it.

There are many days throughout the year, such as Memorial Day, Flag Day, Independence Day, etc., when every American Citizen should display the Flag as an expression of his patriotism and loyalty to the Government; and it is the desire of the American Legion to bring about the display of the Flag on these days above all others. Believing that this could best be accomplished by providing each merchant with a permanent system of displaying the Colors, the American Legion has originated what is nationally known as the Uniform Flag System.

The Uniform Flag System is the displaying of 3' x 5' American Flags on 12' nickel plated brass flag staffs at intervals of approximately twenty-five feet along the curbing throughout the entire city; installing small brass sockets 6" deep in the sidewalk, 12" back from the edge of the curb, which will serve to hold the flag staffs in position when in use. All sockets will be flush with the surface of the sidewalk and adequately covered when not in use to keep out water and dirt.

The fact that over three thousand cities, including such as Philadelphia, Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, Cincinnati and Kansas City have already adopted this system is sufficient proof that it is a practical plan and certainly an economical one. The equipment remains the permanent property of each business firm and

will make it possible for the entire city to be bedecked with flags on any occasion without expense or trouble.

"The Legion realizes that it has undertaken a mighty big job. But we are willing to assume the responsibility for the success of this movement and give the time needed to put it over, as we believe we are rendering a much needed service to our city. The installation of such a flag system will give our Flag a higher standard of usage and will go a long ways toward inculcating the principles of flag etiquette into the very civic life of Washington. We expect to follow up this work with a tremendous educational campaign and have been fortunate in securing a two reel moving picture film on the Flag which we hope to use in the schools and theaters throughout the entire city.

We of the American Legion sincerely hope that the Fine Arts Commission of the District of Columbia will approve our plan to honor the Flag. A committee from the Legion will be present when this matter is taken up by your Commission and will be glad to explain this matter more fully as we want you to thoroughly understand our program. We are submitting herewith a few newspaper clippings and letters of endorsement of the uniform flag system from various parts of the country for your consideration.

The representatives of the American Legion spoke of the plan to install these flag-staffs in Washington, as above set forth. The services of the Boy Scouts would be secured in installing the flags on holiday occasions. The American Legion regards it not only an appropriate but also an effective way to display the flag at one time along a street.

Major U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, who was present, was asked by the Chairman what he thought of the idea. Major Grant said, "I think the idea of uniformity is a good one and I think also the idea of getting away from twisting the flag into an improper shape a good one. There are two questions that do occur to me, one is whether a twelve foot height will clear the passer-by from touching the flag; and whether or not the flags thus displayed along a street would interfere with traffic at street curbs. Mr. Peckham stated that the flag would be over the heads of pedestrians; and the fact that the plan has been adopted in over 3,000 cities, among them some of the largest of the country, was sufficient proof he thought that the flags thus displayed on holiday occasions did not interfere with traffic at street curbs.

The Commission advised that they are in sympathy with the plan proposed, but that before the installation of these flag-staffs along principal streets of Washington shall be authorized, a trial installation should be made along some city block. This the representatives of the American Legion agreed to do. The Commission called attention to the plan of using pennants on holiday occasions, which prevails in Paris, that was recommended at the time designs were made for the new lamp posts of Washington. A report was made to the District Commissioners (Exhibit F).

12. TOURISTS' CAMP: The Commission considered with Major Grant the project to erect a permanent building on the Tourists' Camp, against which the Commission had protested at their meeting on December 10th. Major Grant said that the law of Congress on the subject to erect the building was mandatory, and that it was incumbent upon him,as Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks, to see that it is built.

The Commission said that the Tourists' Camp ought to be removed from East Potomac Park because it prevents development of the approved plan of the park. Attention was called to Bill, H. R.6556, introduced by Representative Zihlman, providing for the construction of artifical bathing beaches, at a cost of $345,000; the Commission of Fine Arts is to advise as to their location. The East Potomac Park plan provides for bathing pools and the Commission would have them constructed there along with other additional recreational facilities. Major Grant said if Congress could be persuaded to relocate the Tourists' Camp somewhere else he could wait a while before beginning construction of the building.

13. BOTANIC GARDEN PLANS: Major Grant submitted three studies A, B and C, and a letter dated January 6, 1926 (Exhibit G), in explanation of them, of

proposed new sites for the Botanic Garden near the Capitol, as contemplated by the Act approved January 7, 1925 (Public Res. No.42,-68th Congress).

Mr. Greenleaf gave these plans special attention, and said he was familiar with the project, having gone over the ground quite recently. Mr. Greenleaf said he did not favor erecting the proposed new conservatory adjacent to the Capitol Grounds, as the glare of the glass would be a source of constant annoyance in looking down from the Capitol. Mr. Greenleaf advised that if this institution must be maintained near the Capitol, sufficient land should be provided to make the project worth while; for this reason he was inclined to favor the Willow Tree Alley plan (C), if the land between it and the Capitol would be made available, as it would permit of a flower garden from the Capitol to the new Conservatory, which would be built on the Willow Tree Alley playground site. The ideal thing, Mr. Greenleaf said, would be to have great gardens south of the Capitol, to conform to the plan proposed for the enlargement of the Capitol Grounds.

The Commission decided to consider the matter with Representative Luce, Chairman of the House Committee on the Library, and Major Grant, at the next meeting of the Commission.

14. BUREAU OF STANDARDS, LANDSCAPE PLAN: The Commission made a trip to the Bureau of Standards and were in conference with Director George K. Burgess as to their problem of future development of the buildings and grounds. Director Burgess stated that the Bureau of Standards, begun in 1902, has grown to comprise 43 acres; that they have 13 buildings and about 750 employes on the place. Several additional buildings are contemplated. The grounds, he said, are in an undeveloped state, and he appreciated the cooperation of the Commission to help him put the grounds in order.

The Commission inspected the grounds, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Greenleaf advised that a building plan be prepared showing present and proposed buildings and connecting roadways. Thereupon a landscape plan is to be made, in which special attention would be given to the treatment of the grounds adjacent to Connecticut Avenue.

15. DEVELOPMENT OF ROSSLYN: The Commission, accompanied by Major Grant and his assistant, Major Brown, were in conference with Mr. E. L. Kirkpatrick, Chairman, Cloyd Byars, and Mr. Sinclair, of the Arlington County Civic Development Committee, as to steps that should be taken to improve conditions at Rosslyn, Virginia, which is the main approach to Washington from the west. The matter was considered in connection with the Greater Arlington Plan, which was recently approved by the Secretary of War. The Committee expressed their willingness to help all they could in the matter, and it was decided that they meet with Major Brown, chairman of the committee handling "Outer Parks" projects for the National Capital Park Commission. It was thought desirable to arrange for a general plan of development for Arlington County.

In the evening the members of the Commission attended a reception at the White House. Mr. Garfield recalled with pleasure the days when he learned to ride a bicycle in the Blue Room.

Exhibit A.

Rear Admiral Bradley A. Fiske (Retired),
Chairman, Navy and Marine Memorial Association,
12 West 8th Street,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Admiral Fiske:

For the Commission:

Very respectfully yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

at the base of the sculpture.

With the view of simplification, such as the omission of some of the insignia
mentioned further with you some other changes they would propose in the design
If these considerations meet your approval then the Commission will
be prepared to approve the design.

The latter alternative seems to the Commission preferable.

Second, Maine Point being an ideal location for a Navy and Marine
Memorial, that an entirely new design, monumental in character, be
prepared for a memorial that would be accessible when seen from every point
of view.

at the entrance to the canal that is planned to cross East Potomac Park.
submitted, and that a site be selected along the Potomac Park, preferably
adhered to, it should be studied on a much smaller scale than the one

First, that if the design of the monument as proposed is to be

been prepared. The Commission of Fine Arts suggests,
sea wall does not justify so elaborate an architectural setting as has
proposed. The Commission feel also that the design of the base and the
small scale, it would not command consideration if executed on the scale
members have felt that while it might be interesting if executed on a
questioned the permanent interest that would attach to such a design. The
was romantic rather than monumental in character. The Commission has

From the beginning the Commission has felt that the system submitted
original decision that the design submitted is not suited to Maine Point.
point of view. This particular phase of the matter was discussed with the
sculptor and the architect. The Commission therefore adheres to its

The system submitted by you is to be seen primarily from only one

traffic up and down the river.
a part of the park system of the District of Columbia. Then there is the
of the islands along the Virginia shore, which islands will in time become
the development of the water park along the Anacostia and the development
river points of the compass. This becomes the more important by reason of
Therefore, it should be occupied only by a monument to be viewed from all
to the effect that that point marks the water gate to the city or Washington.
for other memorials and the decisions of the Commission have been uniform
Point. This site has been considered by the Commission at other times
to the design submitted by you and your Association for the memorial to the
Navy and Marine Forces of the United States.

The Commission of Fine Arts has given prolonged and serious attention

January 12, 1926.

C O P Y

January 9, 1926.

Dear Mr. Talbott:

Your letter of December 22, as to the proposed Spanish-American War Memorial for Lincoln, Nebraska, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 7, 1926.

The design submitted does not meet with the approval of the Commission. It should be much simplified. The portraits and eagles should be omitted. The pedestal should be enlarged so as to be properly related to the monument. A restudy should be made of the entire design.

A small scale model of the revised design (or suitable photographs) and a location plan should be submitted to the Commission.

Yours very truly,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. A. R. Talbot,

603 Terminal Building,

Lincoln, Nebraska.

EXHIBIT B.

COPY

January 8, 1926.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of December 17, requesting the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to the design for the Massachusetts World War Memorial, received the attention of the Commission at their meeting on January 7, 1926.

The Commission approve the design of this memorial, with the suggestion that the draped figure of the American soldier be omitted and that instead a large inscription be provided.

Papers submitted are herewith returned.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major X. H. Price, Secretary,
The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C.

COPY

January 22, 1926.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 7, 1926, gave careful consideration to House Resolution No.90, "To provide a site for the erection of a building of service for the Mothers Memorial Foundation at Washington, District of Columbia", a copy of which you transmitted with your letter of December 21st.

The Commission respectfully report adversely.

The Commission would call attention to the fact that already there is in the Mall the foundation for a building having the same general purpose as the building proposed in this Joint Resolution. Congress, having in view the desirability of providing a large auditorium and assembly rooms in the city of Washington, set apart a site in the Mall on which a structure bearing the name of George Washington Memorial should be built by private contributions. Originally the building proposed was to cost about $3,000,000. The sponsors of the bill in Congress expressed their opinion that such a sum might be raised; or at least so large a fraction of it that Congress might provide for the completion of the building. However, owing partly to increased costs and also to more ambitious ideas of the promoters, the plans as completed called for an expenditure of $10,000,000. These revised plans were never submitted to this Commission.

After years of earnest solicitation on the part of the promoters of the enterprise and after the expenditure of more than $100,000 as a contribution toward promotion, the sum of $500,000 has been raised and expended on foundations. Here the efforts have ceased, at least temporarily, and humanly speaking there is no prospect that the fund to erect the building will be raised. Either Congress must provide the means for completing the building on the foundations or else the space must be cleared. The George Washington Memorial was presented in a manner such as would seem to commend it to patriotically inclined givers. It had the highest political and social backing and yet it has come to a standstill.

With this object lesson clearly presented, the Commission of Fine Arts is compelled to make an adverse report on any measure that proposes to charter an organization, which would of course use the authorization of Congress in order to obtain funds for a project indefinite in its character and nebulous in its appeal.

For the information of your Committee a report by the Commission of Fine Arts on the George Washington Memorial is appended hereto.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. R. M. Elliott, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives.

Exhibit D.

EXHIBIT D.

Copy

January 5, 1910.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 7, 1910, gave careful consideration to House Resolution No. 20, "To provide a site for the erection of a building of service for the Botanic Memorial Foundation at Washington, District of Columbia", a copy of which you transmitted with your letter of December 21st.

The Commission respectfully report adversely.

The Commission would call attention to the fact that already there is in the Mall the foundation for a building having the same general purpose as the building proposed in this Joint Resolution. Congress, having in view the desirability of providing a large auditorium and assembly rooms in the city of Washington, set apart a site in the Mall on which a structure bearing the name of George Washington Memorial should be built by private contributions. Originally the building proposed was to cost about $3,000,000. The sponsors of the bill in Congress expressed their opinion that such a sum might be raised; or at least so large a fraction of it that Congress might provide for the completion of the building. However, owing partly to increased costs and also to more ambitious ideas of the promoters, the plans as completed called for an expenditure of $10,000,000. These revised plans were never submitted to this Commission.

After years of earnest solicitation on the part of the promoters of the enterprise and after the expenditure of more than $100,000 as a contribution toward promotion, the sum of $500,000 has been raised and expended on foundations. Here the efforts have ceased, at least temporarily, and humanly speaking there is no prospect that the fund to erect the building will be raised. Either Congress must provide the means for completing the building on the foundations or else the space must be cleared. The George Washington Memorial was presented in a manner such as would seem to commend it to patriotically inclined givers. It had the highest political and social backing and yet it has come to a standstill.

With this object lesson clearly presented, the Commission of Fine Arts is compelled to make an adverse report on any measure that proposes to charter an organization, which would of course use the indefinite in its character and nebulous in its appeal.

authorization of Congress in order to obtain funds for a project

For the information of your Committee a report by the Commission of Fine Arts on the George Washington Memorial is appended hereto.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. R. M. Elliott, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives.

Exhibit D.

EXHIBIT D.

COPY

June 22, 1921.

Dear Mr. Langley:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 15 with which you transmitted copy of H. J. Res.142, "Stating the true meaning and intent of the provisions relating to the erection and use of the George Washington Memorial Building in the Act * * * approved March 4, 1913, as amended", and stating that the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds desires the recommendations of this Commission with regard to this resolution.

The Commission of Fine Arts understand that Congress granted to the George Washington Memorial Association authority to construct on the north side of the Mall on the former site of the Pennsylvania Railway Station a building and to contain an auditorium capable of seating 7,000 persons, together with smaller auditoriums. It was understood that these halls of various sizes were to be under the control of the Smithsonian Institution and were to be used for convention purposes, by civic and patriotic associations as convention halls are used in other cities.

The Commission know that the George Washington Memorial Association held a competition for plans. This competition had as invited competitors architects of the highest standing. The competition was judged by a competent jury. The successful architects, as required, submitted their plans to the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission approved them without qualifications and with commendation.

The location, the design of the building and the plan, all seemed to the Commission calculated to satisfy a great need of the Government and of the people of the District; and to do so in a manner that would promote the proper and harmonious development of the capital.

Later the Commission have learned through the newspapers that the intention now is to make the building a memorial to the men who served in the Great War and to increase the cost from three to ten million dollars, the money to be raised by public subscription. The question as to the suitability of the building for a war memorial or as to changes in design required by the increase in cost have not been submitted to the Commission. Another announced project has been to provide space in the memorial for Government archives. This subject has not been submitted. It is known, however, that the papers of the War Department alone would require the entire building.

As respects the provision of the joint resolution providing

COPY

June 25, 1921.

Dear Mr. Langley:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 15 with which you transmitted copy of "S. 1. 1, stating the true meaning and intent of the provisions relating to the erection and use of the George Washington Memorial Building in the Act * * * approved March 4, 1913, as amended", and stating that the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds desires the recommendations of this Commission with regard to this resolution.

The Commission of Fine Arts understand that Congress granted to the George Washington Memorial Association authority to construct on the north side of the Mall on the former site of the Pennsylvania Railway Station a building and to contain an auditorium capable of seating 7,000 persons, together with smaller auditoriums. It was understood that these halls of various sizes were to be under the control of the Smithsonian Institution and were to be used for convention purposes, by civic and patriotic associations as convention halls are used in other cities.

The Commission know that the George Washington Memorial Association held a competition for plans. This competition had as invited competitors architects of the highest standing. The competition was judged by a competent jury. The successful architects, as required, submitted their plans to the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission approved them without qualifications and with commendation.

The location, the design of the building and the plan, all seemed to the Commission calculated to satisfy a great need of the Government and of the people of the District; and to do so in a manner that would promote the proper and harmonious development of the capital.

Later the Commission have learned through the newspapers that the intention now is to make the building a memorial to the men who served in the Great War and to increase the cost from three to ten million dollars, the money to be raised by public subscription. The question as to the suitability of the building for a war memorial or as to changes in design required by the increase in cost have not been submitted to the Commission. Another announced project has been to provide space in the memorial for Government archives. This subject has not been submitted. It is known, however, that the powers of the War Department alone would require the entire building.

In response the provision of the joint resolution providing

that the erection of the building may begin as soon as the temporary war buildings have been removed from the site and $500,000 has been paid into the treasury of the George Washington Memorial Association, the Commission respectfully call attention to two unfortunate and humiliating experiences. The first was in connection with the Washington Monument, begun by private subscription, permitted to stand in an unfinished and unsightly condition from 1859 to 1876, and finally taken over and completed by Congress in 1884. The second was in connection with the purchase of Mount Vernon, the project for which was before the people from 1855 until 1859, when the purchase was consummated through the heroic efforts of Anna Pamela Cunningham. In order to prevent an important and conspicuous portion of the Mall from being kept in an unsightly condition during the period required to raise by popular subscription the remaining nineteen-twentieths of the cost of the memorial, the Commission suggest that section two of the Joint Resolution be amended so as to provide that the erection of the building may begin so soon as the Secretary of War shall be satisfied that money will be available to pay the cost of said building constructed in accordance with plans and specifications approved by him.

Sincerely, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. John W. Langley, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

that the erection of the building may begin as soon as the necessary
ter buildings have been removed from the site and ground broken.

ding into the treasury of the George Washington memorial association.
the Commission respectfully call attention to the urgent and
pending emergency. The first use in connection with the Washington
lopment, begun by private subscription, permitted the erection of an
amplified and magnificent structure from 1909 to 1916, and finally began
over and completed by Congress in 1924. The second use in connection
with the problems of Mount Vernon, for which Congress has before
the people from 1926 until 1932, when both purposes had commenced through
the heroic efforts of many loyal Americans. In order to prevent
an important and some ignominious portion of the full fruition of the
an unsightly condition during the period required to raise by popular
subscription the remaining nineteen-twentieths of the cost of the
memorial, the Commission suggest that section two of the Joint resolution
be amended so as to provide that the erection of the building may
be in no wise as the secretary of War shall be satisfied that money
will be available to pay the cost of said building computed in
accordance with plans and specifications approved by him.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

Secretary of War.

Hon. John W. Langley, Chairman,
Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

COPY

January 18, 1926.

My dear Miss Boardman:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 7th considered the design submitted for a memorial to Miss Jane A. Delano and the draft of the bill proposed for such memorial and location on the east side of Seventeenth Street opposite the Red Cross Building.

The Commission were unanimous in their decision that a memorial of the character proposed in the sketch should not be erected in the public grounds between the State, War and Navy Building and B Street. The Commission suggest that the first platform in front of the Red Cross Building offers an entirely suitable site for a single figure. The Commission disapprove the erection of so elaborate an architectural setting wherever the memorial might be placed. The members thought that with the funds at your command you should be able to secure from a competent sculptor a figure which would be a distinct addition and embellishment to the Red Cross Building. They do not think that the funds at your command are sufficient for such an elaborate design as is proposed in the sketch. The Commission understand that the sketch does not represent adequately the figure of a nurse and therefore has not considered this particular feature.

For the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Miss Mabel T. Boardman, Secretary,
The American Red Cross,
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT E

COPY

January 14, 1926.

Dear Sirs:

As suggested in a letter received from your Secretary, dated December 19th, the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on January 7th gave consideration to the proposal of the American Legion with regard to the installation on public highways of 12 foot metal staffs to be placed in sockets along the curb line at intervals of 25 feet, the flags to be 3 x 5 feet in size.

Mr. Frank L. Peckham and Mr. Ray Roberts, representing the American Legion, attended the meeting and the Commission discussed the matter with them. It is understood that this display of the flag at public celebrations is to take the place of the present promiscuous flag display on buildings at such times, and to teach the public proper respect for the flag. Each business house along the street would have the care of one flag. It was stated by the representatives of the American Legion that this plan has been adopted in 3,000 cities of the United States, and a nation-wide campaign is being inaugurated for its adoption in all the cities. At the same time an educational campaign is to be conducted in the public schools of the country to teach the youth a proper respect for the flag.

The Commission looked with favor on this proposal of the American Legion, but before the installation of these flag-staffs along principal streets of Washington shall be authorized, the Commission requested a trial installation be made along some city block. This the representatives of the American Legion offered to do. The Commission felt that possibly the flags thus displayed might interfere with traffic at street curbs and possibly also with the trees. Attention was called also to the fact that the Commission of Fine Arts had heretofore recommended to the District Commissioners the use of pennants in connection with the installation of the improved lighting system of the city. This is a custom that prevails in Paris.

For the Commission:

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia,

Exhibit F

Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT F.

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
THE DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS
OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

REFER TO _____

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
WASHINGTON, D. C.
JAN 7 1926
NOTED _____

January 6, 1926.

Memorandum regarding Botanic Gardens.

In accordance with authority contained in a letter from the Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, dated January 30, 1925, a study has been made with a view to investigation and report to Congress as to a new location for the Botanic Garden, south of the Mall in the vicinity of the present location. It is to be remembered that at present the Botanic Gardens occupy, outside of the Mall, Square West of 576 and the reservations in the center of Canal Street south of Square West of 576.

The first study was made by a committee composed of Mr. Payne, Mr. Clark and Mr. Henlock. Colonel Sherrill directed that in carrying out the study the following areas be considered:

(a) Squares W. 576, 576, and 578, including site of the old canal west of 1st Street to its juncture with Square 576;

(b) Squares 636 and 637, with a portion of C Street lying between these two squares;

(c) Square 534 in conjunction with Square W. 576.

In this first study sites (a) and (b) were eliminated mainly on account of the proposed building development on these two sites. Site (c) was recommended by the committee because; first, it is the largest single square in the vicinity, second, a large part of the square is already Government property and, third, it does not and can not interfere with other plans for the Mall.

The recommendations of this committee were approved by the City and Park Planning Committee under date of August 21, 1925.

The results of these studies were communicated to Mr. Luce, who under date of September 12, 1925, recommended further study of the proposition making the following comment as to Square 534:

"The site you recommend has sundry disadvantages and fails to accomplish certain purposes that it seems to me should be further considered. Among the disadvantages are

distance from the Capitol and shabby surroundings on three sides, which in all probability will never be bettered, for it is hardly conceivable that the neighborhood will ever come up. It can be reached from the Capitol grounds only by crossing two or three streets, and will not be visible either from the Capitol grounds or the Mall, save by glimpses between the proposed buildings that are to front the new Mall. It utilizes present structures only through the period of construction. It does nothing to remedy the Canal Street situation and leaves broad expanses of stone pavements that serve now small practical purpose.

Mr. Luce recommended further study of the location in Squares W. 576, 576, 578 and the Canal Street reservations immediately to the south (which is referred to above as site (a)). Mr. Luce proposed the closing of B Street between 1st and 3d Streets and suggested that it would not be necessary to obtain the entire area of Square 576 and that B Street could be diverted through the southern portion of Square 578 into Canal Street, thence back to its present location at 3d Street.

A study of this proposal was made by Mr. Langdon and Major Brown, who did not favor the proposal to close B Street and the north half of Canal Street.

As a result of further investigation caused by Mr. Luce's proposal, it was suggested that the gardens be located on Squares 636 and 689 immediately south of the Capitol. These two squares slope in all directions from the northeast corner. Therefore, while presenting a very difficult problem to the architect designing any large building to be erected thereon, this slope is advantageous for the gardens. The low buildings incident to a Botanic Garden could be erected without difficulty. However, the proposed House Office Building addition might prevent the carrying out of this plan.

After further correspondence with Mr. Luce, further study was made. It was learned that Mr. Hess favored the addition of Squares 576 and 578 to the area now occupied in Square W. 576. A study was then prepared for the location within these squares, not involving the closing of B Street or Canal Street.

Herewith are drawings as follows:

(a) Suggested layout on Squares 636 and 689.

(b) Suggested layout on Square 634.

(c) Suggested layout on Squares 576 and 578.

EXHIBIT Q.

Carey H. Brown,
Assistant Director.

3 Inc[illegible]